



Air Pollution Exposure and Abnormal Glucose Tolerance during Pregnancy: The Project Viva Cohort

**Abby F. Fleisch, Diane R. Gold, Sheryl L. Rifas-Shiman,
Petros Koutrakis, Joel D. Schwartz, Itai Kloog, Steven Melly,
Brent A. Coull, Antonella Zanobetti, Matthew W. Gillman,
and Emily Oken**

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1289/ehp.1307065>

Received: 9 May 2013

Accepted: 5 February 2014

Advance Publication: 7 February 2014

Air Pollution Exposure and Abnormal Glucose Tolerance during Pregnancy: The Project Viva Cohort

Abby F. Fleisch,¹ Diane R. Gold,^{2,3} Sheryl L. Rifas-Shiman,⁴ Petros Koutrakis,³ Joel D. Schwartz,³ Itai Kloog,^{3,5} Steven Melly,³ Brent A. Coull,⁶ Antonella Zanobetti,³ Matthew W. Gillman,^{4,7} and Emily Oken⁴

¹Division of Endocrinology, Boston Children's Hospital, Boston, Massachusetts, USA;

²Channing Laboratory, Brigham and Women's Hospital, Boston, Massachusetts, USA;

³Department of Environmental Health, Harvard School of Public Health, Boston, Massachusetts, USA; ⁴Obesity Prevention Program, Department of Population Medicine, Harvard Medical

School and Harvard Pilgrim Health Care Institute, Boston, Massachusetts, USA; ⁵Department of Geography and Environmental Development, Ben-Gurion University of the Negev, Beer Sheva, Israel;

⁶Department of Biostatistics, Harvard School of Public Health, Boston, Massachusetts, USA;

⁷Department of Nutrition, Harvard School of Public Health, Boston, Massachusetts, USA

Address correspondence to Abby F. Fleisch, Division of Endocrinology, Boston Children's Hospital, 300 Longwood Ave., Boston, MA 02115 USA. Telephone: 617-355-7476. Fax: 617-730-0194. E-mail: abby.fleisch@childrens.harvard.edu

Running title: Air Pollution and Glucose Tolerance during Pregnancy

Acknowledgments: We thank Lenie van Rossem for helpful input into the use and interpretation of exposure measures.

Funding: The authors have received support from the National Institutes of Health (K24 HD069408, R01HD 034568, P30 DK092924, P03ES000002, P01 ES009825, K12 DK094721-02); the US Environmental Protection Agency (RD83479801), the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (T32 HS000063), the Harvard School of Public Health, and the Harvard Pilgrim Health Care Institute.

Competing financial interests: The authors have no competing interests.

Abstract

Background: Exposure to fine particulate matter (PM_{2.5}) has been linked to type 2 diabetes mellitus, but associations with hyperglycemia in pregnancy have not been well studied.

Methods: We studied Boston-area pregnant women without known diabetes. We identified impaired glucose tolerance (IGT) and gestational diabetes mellitus (GDM) during pregnancy from clinical glucose tolerance tests at median 28.1 weeks gestation. We used residential addresses to estimate second trimester PM_{2.5} and black carbon exposure via a central monitoring site and spatiotemporal models. We estimated residential traffic density and roadway proximity as surrogates for exposure to traffic-related air pollution. We performed multinomial logistic regression analyses adjusted for sociodemographic covariates and used multiple imputation to account for missing data.

Results: Of 2,093 women, 65 (3%) had IGT and 118 (6%) GDM. Second trimester spatiotemporal exposures ranged from 8.5 to 15.9 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ for PM_{2.5} and from 0.1 to 1.7 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ for black carbon. Traffic density was 0-30,860 vehicles/day x length of road (km) within 100 m; 281 (13%) women lived ≤ 200 m from a major road. The prevalence of IGT was elevated in the highest (vs. lowest) quartile of exposure to spatiotemporal PM_{2.5} (OR 2.63; 95% CI: 1.15, 6.01) and traffic density (OR 2.66; 95% CI: 1.24, 5.71). IGT also was positively associated with other exposure measures, though associations were not statistically significant. No pollutant exposures were positively associated with GDM.

Conclusions: Greater exposure to PM_{2.5} and other traffic-related pollutants during pregnancy was associated with IGT but not GDM. Air pollution may contribute to abnormal glycemia in pregnancy.

Introduction

Air pollution, especially fine particulate matter (PM_{2.5}), which is composed of particles with an aerodynamic diameter of less than 2.5 µm, may promote insulin resistance [reviewed in (Rajagopalan and Brook 2012)]. PM_{2.5} results from combustion and is a constituent of automobile exhaust and power plant emission. It is composed of black (elemental) carbon, organic carbon, sulfates, nitrates, metals, dust, and biological material. Because of its small size, PM_{2.5} readily enters the bronchi and alveoli. PM_{2.5} has been associated with local and systemic inflammation and adverse cardiorespiratory outcomes. For example, PM_{2.5}-exposed rodents developed pulmonary (Happo et al. 2012) and systemic (Wang et al. 2013) inflammation and impaired cardiovascular function (Wang et al. 2013). In population-based human studies, higher PM_{2.5} exposure was associated with increased systemic inflammation in pregnant women (Lee et al. 2011) and increased cardiorespiratory hospitalizations in non-pregnant adults (Dominici et al. 2006).

In high fat diet and normal weight rodent models, PM_{2.5} exposure induced insulin resistance by promoting adipose inflammation and through potential disruption of insulin signal transduction (Sun et al. 2009; Xu et al. 2011). Several adult cohort studies have explored associations between long-term particulate matter exposure and self-reported type 2 diabetes mellitus (Andersen et al. 2012; Brook et al. 2008; Coogan et al. 2012; Kramer et al. 2010; Pearson et al. 2010; Puett et al. 2011), and all but one (Puett et al. 2011) reported positive associations between diabetes and particulate matter exposures.

Pregnancy is a particularly vulnerable time for the development of abnormal glycemia because insulin resistance increases as part of the normal physiological adaptation to ensure fuel transfer

to the fetus. Up to 18% of pregnant women worldwide develop some degree of abnormal glucose tolerance by the end of the second trimester (Sacks et al. 2012). About one third of these women meet current diagnostic criteria for gestational diabetes mellitus (GDM), and the remaining two thirds have impaired glucose tolerance (IGT), a milder form of glucose intolerance (International Association of Diabetes Pregnancy Study Groups Consensus Panel et al. 2010), which, like GDM, is associated with adverse maternal (Retnakaran et al. 2008) and fetal (Hapo Study Cooperative Research Group et al. 2008) outcomes. In contrast with type 2 diabetes, which often develops over years and for which diagnosis is often delayed (Inzucchi 2012) insulin resistance in pregnancy develops during the second trimester, and screening routinely occurs at the end of this trimester (Butte 2000). Thus, when considering air pollution effects on glycemia, focusing on insulin resistance during pregnancy permits evaluation of acute, directly relevant exposure windows.

A cohort study in the Netherlands (van den Hooven et al. 2009) reported no association between traffic density and GDM, whereas a study of birth registry data in Sweden reported a monotonic dose-response association between NO_x and GDM and positive associations with traffic density (Malmqvist et al. 2013). However, neither study measured $\text{PM}_{2.5}$ or black carbon exposure, neither assessed more mild degrees of GDM, and the Swedish cohort did not include individual-level socioeconomic status covariate data.

The primary objective of the present analysis was to evaluate the association of second trimester $\text{PM}_{2.5}$ exposure, using two exposure assessment approaches, with glycemia in a large cohort of pregnant women residing in the greater Boston area. We hypothesized that $\text{PM}_{2.5}$ exposure would be positively associated with IGT and GDM. Secondary objectives were to estimate associations

with additional measures of exposure to traffic-related air pollution, including black carbon concentration, neighborhood traffic density, and home roadway proximity.

Methods

Study population and design

From 1999 to 2002, we recruited Boston-area women at their first prenatal visit to Harvard Vanguard Medical Associates, a multi-specialty group practice with 8 urban and suburban obstetric offices throughout Eastern Massachusetts, to participate in the Project Viva cohort. Eligibility criteria for Project Viva included fluency in English, gestational age of ≤ 22 weeks at enrollment, and singleton pregnancy. 2,128 women with a live birth were included in Project Viva, and for the present analysis, we excluded 16 women with pre-existing type 1 or type 2 diabetes mellitus and 19 women without any exposure measurements available. Of the remaining 2,093, the number included in each analysis varied from 1584-2092 based on the availability of exposure data (Table 1).

Participants provided their residential address at enrollment and updated it at the second study visit, timed to coincide with clinical glycemic screening (median 28.1 weeks). We estimated exposures for all women who lived at an address in our catchment area for at least 75% of the second trimester. Geocoding and spatial analyses were done using ArcGIS v. 10.1 and StreetMapTM roads (ESRI, Redlands, CA).

All participants provided written informed consent, and Institutional Review Boards (IRBs) of the participating sites approved the study.

Air pollution exposure assessments

We measured daily PM_{2.5} and black carbon at a monitoring site located atop the Harvard University Countway Library in Boston, Massachusetts (Kang et al. 2010). We assigned these daily central site values to women living within 40 km of the monitor.

We also estimated PM_{2.5} and black carbon concentrations at each woman's residential address using spatiotemporal models. Although estimated, these concentrations had the advantage of more closely matching a woman's residential address than central-site measurements. Also, spatiotemporal models allowed for spatial as well as temporal variability (i.e. two women pregnant at a similar time but living in different neighborhoods could have different exposures). For estimates of daily spatiotemporal PM_{2.5} exposure (Kloog 2011), we used mixed effects models with random slopes for day and nested regions to calibrate daily satellite Aerosol Optical Depth (AOD) data at a resolution of a 10 x 10 km spatial grid (2000–2008) with all monitored PM_{2.5} measurements in New England. We then used a generalized additive mixed model with spatial smoothing and regional measured PM_{2.5}, AOD values in neighboring cells, and land use variables to estimate PM_{2.5} for location-day pairs with missing AOD. The “out of sample” tenfold cross validation R^2 for days with and without available AOD data was 0.83 and 0.81, respectively.

We estimated daily spatiotemporal black carbon exposure at each residential address using a validated spatiotemporal land-use regression model (Gryparis A 2007) that included daily average black carbon estimates from 148 monitoring stations from January 1999 to August 2011. Predictors in the final model included address-specific land use, 2009 traffic density, daily meteorological factors, other seasonal characteristics, and their interactions. We also used data

from the Boston central monitoring site to reflect daily variations in black carbon in the region. For each of the pollutants, we estimated second trimester exposures by averaging daily concentrations from day 94 through day 187 after last menstrual period.

We estimated neighborhood traffic density (average daily traffic (vehicles/day) x length of road (km) within 100 m) using the 2002 road inventory from MA Executive Office of Transportation [as in (Kloog et al. 2012; Zeka et al. 2008)]. Home roadway proximity (distance to Census Feature Class Code A1 or A2 roads) was calculated using US and Canada detailed streets from Street MapTM North America ArcGIS 10 Data and Maps (time period of content 2005). For both variables we used residential address at study enrollment (median 9.9 weeks gestation).

Glycemic screening and classification of glucose tolerance status

At the end of the second trimester of gestation (median 28.1 weeks), participating women completed routine clinical screening for GDM (Herring et al. 2009). If serum glucose one hour after a non-fasting 50g oral glucose challenge test (GCT) was ≥ 140 mg/dL, the participant was referred for a 3-hour fasting 100-g oral glucose tolerance test (OGTT). Normal OGTT results, as per American Diabetes Association (ADA) criteria (American Diabetes Association 2008), were blood glucose ≤ 95 mg/dL at baseline, ≤ 180 mg/dL at 1 hour, ≤ 155 mg/dL at 2 hours, and ≤ 140 mg/dL at 3 hours. Based on a combination of the GCT and OGTT results, we focused on two categories of glucose intolerance: (1) we defined GDM as failing the GCT with ≥ 2 high values on the OGTT as per ADA criteria (American Diabetes Association 2008), and (2) we defined IGT as failing the GCT (1-hour glucose result of ≥ 140 mg/dL) with 1 high value on the OGTT. While there is not currently a uniformly recognized definition for IGT during pregnancy, this definition allowed for comparison to previously published work (Herring et al. 2009; Retnakaran

et al. 2008; Saldana et al. 2006). The reference group (normal glucose tolerance [NGT]) comprised women with GCT results ≤ 140 mg/dL who did not have OGTT testing. We classified the remaining mothers who had GCT results ≥ 140 mg/dL but no high values on the OGTT as a separate outcome group because data are mixed regarding whether maternal and fetal outcomes for women with these laboratory results are different from women with NGT (Hillier et al. 2007; Retnakaran et al. 2008).

Assessment of covariates

Using a combination of interviews and questionnaires, we collected information on participants' age, race/ethnicity, education, household income, history of GDM in a previous pregnancy, family history of diabetes mellitus, smoking habits, and gestational age based on the date of the last menstrual period updated with ultrasound. We calculated pre-pregnancy BMI (kg/m^2) from self-reported height and weight. We calculated total gestational weight gain up to glycemic screening as the difference between the weight measured on the date of the glycemic screen and self-reported pre-pregnancy weight (Herring et al. 2009).

Statistical analysis

We used multinomial logistic regression analyses to evaluate associations of air pollution exposures with IGT and GDM. In each model, we estimated separate ORs for 4 possible outcomes: 1) NGT, which we used as a common “reference” outcome, 2) failed GCT normal OGTT, 3) IGT, and 4) GDM. We estimated separate ORs for these outcomes because other studies have shown different predictors for IGT versus GDM (Hillier et al. 2007; Saldana et al. 2006).

We considered each of the exposures (central-site PM_{2.5}, spatiotemporal PM_{2.5}, central-site black carbon, spatiotemporal black carbon, traffic density, and distance to roadway) in separate models. We initially modeled PM_{2.5}, black carbon, and traffic density exposures as categorical variables (in quartiles) to assess for potential non-linearity of exposure-outcome relationships. We *a priori* dichotomized proximity to major roadway as $>$ or \leq 200 m for consistency with previous studies using $>$ 200m as a reference group (Puett et al. 2011; van den Hooven et al. 2009). We first fit unadjusted models. Next we created a full multivariate model for each of the exposures that included as covariates maternal age (continuous), pre-pregnancy BMI (continuous), pregnancy weight gain through time of OGTT (continuous), race/ethnicity (white, black, Asian, Hispanic, other), education (with or without college degree), smoking habits (never, former, or during pregnancy), season of last menstrual period (4 seasons), prior GDM (yes, no, or nulliparous), family history of diabetes (yes or no), and household income ($>$ \$70,000 or \leq \$70,000). We then excluded household income and smoking habits, as neither was a confounder of the relationship of any of the exposures with IGT or GDM (i.e. the estimate for the primary exposure changed by $<$ 10%). Because categorical exposure-outcome relationships appeared linear, we also modeled PM_{2.5}, black carbon, and traffic density exposures as continuous measures, and expressed associations per interquartile range (IQR) increase in exposure.

As is common in large epidemiologic analyses, many participants were missing data on one or more variables. We used chained equations to multiply impute missing values (White et al. 2011) (the MI procedure in SAS). We generated 50 imputed datasets, and all model results were generated by appropriately combining these results (Rubin 2004). To avoid incorrect

imputations, we used all 2,128 cohort participants with live births and included all covariates as well as exposure and outcome variables in the imputation process (White et al. 2011). In the analytic dataset, we only included participants with measured exposures ($n = 2,093$). In women missing outcome data ($n = 43$), we imputed outcomes in addition to covariates. Including imputed outcome data could add additional covariate information and would not be expected to bias regression results because exposure data were not imputed and outcomes were assumed to be missing at random (Little 1992).

We performed several sensitivity analyses. We individually included additional covariates for trends over time (based on the calendar date of the LMP), pre-pregnancy BMI squared, and 1999 census tract median household income (based on residential address at enrollment) (United States Census Bureau 2000a) to the final model. We also limited the analysis to the subset of women with no history of prior GDM ($n = 2,051$) and the subset of women with a measured rather than imputed outcome ($n = 2,050$). Because spatiotemporal $PM_{2.5}$ and traffic density were both significantly associated with IGT and were not highly collinear, we considered both exposures concomitantly in the final model. All analyses were conducted using SAS Version 9.3 (SAS Institute Inc, Cary, NC).

Results

Of the 2,093 women in the study population, 65 (3%) had IGT and 118 (6%) had GDM. Second trimester mean (SD, range) central-site $PM_{2.5}$ was $10.9 \mu g/m^3$ (1.4, 8.3-17.2) and spatiotemporal $PM_{2.5}$ was $11.9 \mu g/m^3$ (1.4, 8.5-15.9). Thus, we anticipate that $PM_{2.5}$ annual averages in the study population were almost uniformly lower than the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) threshold for annual exposure, which is $15 \mu g/m^3$. Second trimester mean (SD, range) central-

site black carbon was $0.9 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ (0.1, 0.6-1.1) and spatiotemporal black carbon was $0.7 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ (0.2, 0.1-1.7). Traffic density mean (SD, range) was 1,621 (2,234, 0-30,860) vehicles/day x km of road within 100 m; 272 (13%) of the women lived within 200 m of a major roadway. Central-site $\text{PM}_{2.5}$ and black carbon were not correlated with traffic density or roadway proximity, and other exposures were moderately correlated (spearman correlation coefficients 0.08-0.79) (see Supplemental Material, Table S1). Mean age at enrollment was 31.8 years, and mean pre-pregnancy BMI was $24.9 \text{ kg}/\text{m}^2$ (Table 2). Only a small percentage of women had a family history of diabetes (8%) or prior gestational diabetes (2%). Imputation had little or no influence on the distribution of participant characteristics (see Supplemental Material, Table S2). Women recruited prior to March 2000, when satellite measurements became available, and who therefore were not included in analyses of spatiotemporal $\text{PM}_{2.5}$, had lower central-site $\text{PM}_{2.5}$ exposure and higher black carbon exposure but did not differ from other participants in terms of sociodemographic characteristics or the proportions of women with IGT or GDM (see Supplemental Material, Table S2). Of the covariates, only race/ethnicity varied by exposure status with white women living more frequently at addresses with lower $\text{PM}_{2.5}$, and black, Hispanic, and Asian women at addresses with higher $\text{PM}_{2.5}$ exposure (Table 2).

In covariate-adjusted models, women in the highest (Q4) (vs. lowest (Q1)) quartile of second trimester $\text{PM}_{2.5}$ exposure had 1.90 times the odds (95% CI: 0.84, 4.31) of IGT vs. normoglycemia when $\text{PM}_{2.5}$ exposure was measured at the central monitoring station and 2.63 times the odds (95% CI: 1.15, 6.01) of IGT when $\text{PM}_{2.5}$ was estimated by the spatiotemporal model. Odds of IGT vs. normoglycemia for women in higher (Q2, Q3, Q4) vs. the lowest (Q1) quartile of $\text{PM}_{2.5}$ exposure were consistently positive when $\text{PM}_{2.5}$ was measured at the central

monitoring station and increased monotonically across quartiles when PM_{2.5} was estimated by the spatiotemporal model (Table 3). Results of unadjusted models were similar [e.g. odds of IGT for Q4 vs. Q1 was 1.82 (95% CI: 0.83, 3.99) for central-site PM_{2.5} and 2.40 (95% CI: 1.08, 5.31) for spatiotemporal PM_{2.5}].

Women in the highest (vs. lowest) quartile of second trimester black carbon exposure also had increased odds of IGT vs. normoglycemia in covariate-adjusted models, but confidence intervals included the null whether black carbon was measured at the central monitoring station (OR 2.87; 95% CI: 0.93, 8.83) or estimated by the spatiotemporal model (OR 1.50; 95% CI: 0.65, 3.50). Odds of IGT vs. normoglycemia increased monotonically across quartiles when black carbon was measured at the central monitoring station and were consistently higher in Q2, Q3, and Q4 vs. Q1 when black carbon was estimated by the spatiotemporal model (Table 3). In covariate-adjusted models, odds of IGT vs. normoglycemia were also increased in women who lived in a neighborhood with the highest (vs. lowest) quartile of traffic density (OR: 2.66; 95% CI: 1.24, 5.71), although Q2, Q3, Q4 vs. Q1 ORs did not increase monotonically, and, in fact, the Q3 vs. Q1 comparison was close to 1. Women who lived ≤ 200 m (vs. > 200 m) from a major roadway also had increased odds of IGT vs normoglycemia (OR: 1.83; 95% CI: 0.96, 3.50) (Table 3).

There was no relationship between any exposure and GDM in either the unadjusted (data not shown) or covariate-adjusted models, with odds ratios for GDM generally below 1 (Table 3). When we represented PM_{2.5}, black carbon, and traffic density exposures as continuous variables (per IQR), relationships with IGT were consistently positive and with GDM were consistently null (Figure 1).

In covariate-adjusted models, odds of a failed GCT/normal OGTT vs. normoglycemia were not increased for women in the highest (vs. lowest) quartile of spatiotemporal PM_{2.5} (OR 1.11; 95% CI: 0.64, 1.94) or other exposures (Table 3). When we included a variable for time trend or pre-pregnancy BMI squared to the final model, results were unchanged (data not shown). Inclusion of census tract median income slightly attenuated effect estimates for associations of IGT with spatiotemporal black carbon (OR for Q4 vs Q1: 1.24; 95% CI: 0.51, 3.05), spatiotemporal PM_{2.5} (2.4; 95% CI: 1.04, 5.53), and traffic density (2.41; 95% CI: 1.11, 5.25) but not for any other exposure-outcome relationships. When we restricted the analyses to women without prior GDM or to women with a measured rather than imputed outcome, results were also unchanged (data not shown). When we included both spatiotemporal PM_{2.5} and traffic density in the same adjusted model, odds of failed GCT/normal OGTT, IGT, or GDM vs. normoglycemia per IQR increase in exposure were essentially unchanged. For example, an IQR increase in spatiotemporal PM_{2.5} exposure increased odds of IGT by 1.60 (95% CI: 1.08, 2.37) (vs. single pollutant model OR: 1.64; 95% CI: 1.11, 2.42), and an IQR increase in traffic density increased odds of IGT by 1.17 (95% CI: 1.01, 1.35) (vs. single pollutant model OR 1.15 (1.0, 1.31).

Discussion

Among pregnant women residing in the greater Boston area, second trimester PM_{2.5} exposure was positively associated with IGT, but not frank gestational diabetes. Second trimester black carbon exposure, and traffic density and roadway proximity based on enrollment address also appeared to be associated with IGT.

Our results are consistent with previous studies suggesting glycemic effects of air pollution. Long-term exposure to PM_{2.5} and PM₁₀ and self-reported type 2 diabetes mellitus has been

studied in several adult cohorts (Andersen et al. 2012; Brook et al. 2008; Coogan et al. 2012; Kramer et al. 2010; Pearson et al. 2010; Puett et al. 2011), of which all but one (Puett et al. 2011) reported positive associations between diabetes and particulate matter exposures. Studies of short-term PM_{2.5} and PM₁₀ exposure in adults have also demonstrated an association between exposure during the days prior to a blood draw and biochemical measures of insulin resistance (Brook et al. 2013; Kim and Hong 2012).

Two prior studies have considered air pollution exposure and glycemia in pregnancy, and results were conflicting. A cohort study of > 7,000 pregnant women in the Netherlands (van den Hooven et al. 2009) found no association between traffic density and GDM. In contrast, a study of birth registry data for > 81,000 births in Sweden (Malmqvist et al. 2013) reported monotonic dose-response associations between NO_x and GDM, and positive associations with traffic density.

In rodent models, PM_{2.5} exposure resulted in greater oxidative stress and adipose tissue inflammation [reviewed in (Anderson et al. 2012; Franchini et al. 2012)]. Adipose inflammatory changes included increased pro-inflammatory to anti-inflammatory macrophage ratio and insulin signaling abnormalities, which could lead to insulin resistance (Sun et al. 2009; Xu et al. 2011). Obesity-induced insulin resistance is thought to similarly occur as a direct result of adipose inflammation (Ye 2013).

It is uncertain whether the traffic components of PM (e.g., black carbon) are responsible for these associations. Traffic and non-traffic PM components have been associated with increases in systemic inflammatory markers and with adverse vascular responses in adults with diabetes (Gold 2008; O'Neill et al. 2005). In the present study, an IQR increase in PM_{2.5} exposure

(estimated in spatiotemporal models) was more strongly associated with IGT than an IQR increase in traffic density when both variables were included in the same adjusted model. While this difference could reflect different degrees of measurement error in the exposure variables, it may also suggest an greater impact of non-traffic PM vs. traffic-related PM on IGT. Traffic density captures spatial variability from locally generated air pollution but lacks temporal resolution, so may have been less strongly related to IGT due to inadequate capture of regional particle movement occurring specifically during a woman's second trimester of pregnancy.

While there was an association of air pollution exposure with IGT, contrary to our hypothesis, we did not demonstrate an association with frank gestational diabetes. In fact, odds ratios for GDM were generally below 1, although confidence intervals all included the null. This result is consistent with several studies that have reported gestational weight gain, another modifiable exposure during gestation, to be associated with IGT but not GDM (Herring et al. 2009; Saldana et al. 2006; Tovar et al. 2009). Mothers predisposed to eventually develop GDM may enter pregnancy with an array of pre-existing risk factors such as greater pregravid weight and family history of diabetes (Solomon et al. 1997) and may develop GDM regardless of additional behavioral or environmental risk factors during pregnancy. Thus, more severe degrees of hyperglycemia may be less sensitive to short-term exposures. Another possible explanation for the differential results for IGT versus GDM is that individuals with undiagnosed, pre-existing diabetes may have been included in the GDM group, thus limiting our ability to demonstrate an association with pregnancy-specific exposures. In any case, it will be necessary to replicate this finding in future work, as prior studies of air pollution and glucose tolerance in pregnancy (Malmqvist et al. 2013; van den Hooven et al. 2009) did not include a separate IGT designation.

Even mild degrees of abnormal glycemia in pregnancy (i.e. IGT) have been associated with adverse perinatal clinical outcomes (Hapo Study Cooperative Research Group et al. 2008; Sermer et al. 1995) and future obesity and insulin resistance in both mother and offspring (Hillier et al. 2007). To put our findings into perspective, the extent to which second trimester spatiotemporal PM_{2.5} exposure increased odds of IGT in the present study (OR 2.63; 95% CI: 1.15, 6.01, for highest versus lowest quartile of exposure) is of the same order of magnitude as that of other well known risk factors for IGT. For example, in our cohort, the odds ratio of IGT was 2.54 (95% CI: 1.25, 5.15) for women in the highest versus lowest quartile of gestational weight gain and was 1.89 (95% CI: 1.04-3.44) for those with pregravid overweight versus normal weight (Herring et al. 2009).

Potential exposure misclassification is a limitation of the present study. The PM_{2.5} spatiotemporal model we used had a high mean out-of-sample R^2 , and use of satellite aerosol optical depth data was a strength, but air pollution estimates (for both PM_{2.5} and black carbon models) were based on residential address, and we did not have information on work location or time spent at home which could have improved the accuracy of exposure estimates (Nethery et al. 2008). Also, the PM_{2.5} spatiotemporal model estimated 10 x 10 km exposures which could limit local contrast. However, the 2,093 women lived in 110 different 10 x 10 km cells throughout Eastern Massachusetts, so there was still broad exposure variability. Also, the number of women with PM_{2.5} spatiotemporal estimates based on satellite data, which was not available before March 2000, was limited. As compared to those with available estimates, women missing spatiotemporal PM_{2.5} estimates had differences in their exposure profile, likely as a result of changing exposures over time. However, exposure differences would not be expected to bias

results, as these women did not differ in terms of sociodemographic characteristics or proportion of IGT or GDM. As women were pregnant from 1999-2002, our use of 2009 traffic density in the black carbon spatiotemporal model may have increased exposure misclassification. Another limitation is use of self-reported pre-pregnancy weight, which may be underestimated, but a prior validation study of 170 Project Viva participants with measured prepregnancy weight suggested that ranking of individuals is preserved, and weight reporting did not differ by BMI or race/ethnicity (Oken et al. 2007). Also, generalizability may be limited as our cohort was older and mostly white, although the proportions of racial/ethnic minorities in Project Viva were higher than in Massachusetts as a whole, according to the 2000 census (United States Census Bureau 2000b). Strengths of our study include use of a large, prospective cohort with several measures of air pollution exposure and inclusion of multiple potential confounding variables. However, we did not account for every factor that might be related to pollution exposure and GDM risk, such as physical activity.

Conclusions

In summary, second trimester PM_{2.5} exposure was associated with impaired glucose tolerance, but not GDM, among pregnant women with air pollution exposures that were generally below current EPA air quality guidelines. Our results lend support to the emerging body of evidence that air pollution exposure is associated with abnormal glycemia.

References

- Aguilera I, Sunyer J, Fernández-Patier R, Hoek G, Aguirre-Alfaro A, Meliefste K, et al. 2007. Estimation of Outdoor NO_x, NO₂, and BTEX Exposure in a Cohort of Pregnant Women Using Land Use Regression Modeling. *Environ Sci Technol* 42(3):815-821.
- American Diabetes Association. 2008. Standards of medical care in diabetes--2008. *Diabetes Care* 31 Suppl 1:S12-54.
- Andersen ZJ, Raaschou-Nielsen O, Ketzel M, Jensen SS, Hvidberg M, Loft S, et al. 2012. Diabetes incidence and long-term exposure to air pollution: a cohort study. *Diabetes Care* 35(1):92-98.
- Anderson JO, Thundiyil JG, Stolbach A. 2012. Clearing the air: a review of the effects of particulate matter air pollution on human health. *J Med Toxicol* 8(2):166-175.
- Brook RD, Jerrett M, Brook JR, Bard RL, Finkelstein MM. 2008. The relationship between diabetes mellitus and traffic-related air pollution. *J Occup Environ Med* 50(1):32-38.
- Brook RD, Xu X, Bard RL, Dvonch JT, Morishita M, Kaciroti N, et al. 2013. Reduced metabolic insulin sensitivity following sub-acute exposures to low levels of ambient fine particulate matter air pollution. *Sci Total Environ* 448:66-71.
- Butte NF. 2000. Carbohydrate and lipid metabolism in pregnancy: normal compared with gestational diabetes mellitus. *Am J Clin Nutr* 71(5 Suppl):1256S-1261S.
- Coogan PF, White LF, Jerrett M, Brook RD, Su JG, Seto E, et al. 2012. Air pollution and incidence of hypertension and diabetes mellitus in black women living in Los Angeles. *Circulation* 125(6):767-772.
- Dominici F, Peng RD, Bell ML, Pham L, McDermott A, Zeger SL, et al. 2006. Fine particulate air pollution and hospital admission for cardiovascular and respiratory diseases. *JAMA* 295(10):1127-1134.
- Franchini M, Guida A, Tufano A, Coppola A. 2012. Air pollution, vascular disease and thrombosis: linking clinical data and pathogenic mechanisms. *J Thromb Haemost* 10(12):2438-2451.
- Gold DR. 2008. Vulnerability to cardiovascular effects of air pollution in people with diabetes. *Curr Diab Rep* 8(5):333-335.

- Gryparis A CB, Schwartz J, Suh HH. 2007. Semiparametric latent variable regression models for spatio-temporal modeling of mobile source particles in the greater Boston area. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series C (Applied Statistics)* 56(2):183-209.
- Hapo Study Cooperative Research Group, Metzger BE, Lowe LP, Dyer AR, Trimble ER, Chaovarindr U, et al. 2008. Hyperglycemia and adverse pregnancy outcomes. *N Engl J Med* 358(19):1991-2002.
- Happo MS, Uski O, Jalava PI, Kelz J, Brunner T, Hakulinen P, et al. 2012. Pulmonary inflammation and tissue damage in the mouse lung after exposure to PM samples from biomass heating appliances of old and modern technologies. *Sci Total Environ* 443C:256-266.
- Herring SJ, Oken E, Rifas-Shiman SL, Rich-Edwards JW, Stuebe AM, Kleinman KP, et al. 2009. Weight gain in pregnancy and risk of maternal hyperglycemia. *Am J Obstet Gynecol* 201(1):61 e61-67.
- Hillier TA, Pedula KL, Schmidt MM, Mullen JA, Charles MA, Pettitt DJ. 2007. Childhood obesity and metabolic imprinting: the ongoing effects of maternal hyperglycemia. *Diabetes Care* 30(9):2287-2292.
- International Association of Diabetes Pregnancy Study Groups Consensus Panel, Metzger BE, Gabbe SG, Persson B, Buchanan TA, Catalano PA, et al. 2010. International association of diabetes and pregnancy study groups recommendations on the diagnosis and classification of hyperglycemia in pregnancy. *Diabetes Care* 33(3):676-682.
- Inzucchi SE. 2012. Clinical practice. Diagnosis of diabetes. *N Engl J Med* 367(6): 542-550.
- Kang CM, Koutrakis P, Suh HH. 2010. Hourly measurements of fine particulate sulfate and carbon aerosols at the Harvard-U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Supersite in Boston. *J Air Waste Manag Assoc* 60(11):1327-1334.
- Kim JH, Hong YC. 2012. GSTM1, GSTT1, and GSTP1 Polymorphisms and Associations between Air Pollutants and Markers of Insulin Resistance in Elderly Koreans. *Environ Health Perspect* 120(10):1378-1384.
- Kloog I, Melly SJ, Ridgway WL, Coull BA, Schwartz J. 2012. Using new satellite based exposure methods to study the association between pregnancy PM_{2.5} exposure, premature birth and birth weight in Massachusetts. *Environ Health* 11:40.

- Kloog IK, P; Coull, BA; Joo Lee, H; Schwartz, J. 2011. Assessing temporally and spatially resolved PM_{2.5} exposures for epidemiological studies using satellite aerosol optical depth measurements. *Atmospheric Environment* 45:6267-6275.
- Kramer U, Herder C, Sugiri D, Strassburger K, Schikowski T, Ranft U, et al. 2010. Traffic-related air pollution and incident type 2 diabetes: results from the SALIA cohort study. *Environ Health Perspect* 118(9):1273-1279.
- Lee PC, Talbott EO, Roberts JM, Catov JM, Sharma RK, Ritz B. 2011. Particulate air pollution exposure and C-reactive protein during early pregnancy. *Epidemiology* 22(4): 524-531.
- Little R, JA. 1992. Regression with Missing X's: A Review. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 87(420):1227-1237.
- Malmqvist E, Jakobsson K, Tinnerberg H, Rignell-Hydbom A, Rylander L. 2013. Gestational diabetes and preeclampsia in association with air pollution at levels below current air quality guidelines. *Environ Health Perspect* 121(4):488-493.
- Nethery E, Leckie SE, Teschke K, Brauer M. 2008. From measures to models: an evaluation of air pollution exposure assessment for epidemiological studies of pregnant women. *Occup Environ Med* 65(9):579-586.
- O'Neill MS, Veves A, Zanobetti A, Sarnat JA, Gold DR, Economides PA, et al. 2005. Diabetes enhances vulnerability to particulate air pollution-associated impairment in vascular reactivity and endothelial function. *Circulation* 111(22):2913-2920.
- Oken E, Taveras EM, Kleinman KP, Rich-Edwards JW, Gillman MW. 2007. Gestational weight gain and child adiposity at age 3 years. *Am J Obstet Gynecol* 196(4):322 e321-328.
- Pearson JF, Bachireddy C, Shyamprasad S, Goldfine AB, Brownstein JS. 2010. Association between fine particulate matter and diabetes prevalence in the U.S. *Diabetes Care* 33(10):2196-2201.
- Puett RC, Hart JE, Schwartz J, Hu FB, Liese AD, Laden F. 2011. Are particulate matter exposures associated with risk of type 2 diabetes? *Environ Health Perspect* 119(3):384-389.
- Rajagopalan S, Brook RD. 2012. Air pollution and type 2 diabetes: mechanistic insights. *Diabetes* 61(12):3037-3045.
- Retnakaran R, Qi Y, Sermer M, Connelly PW, Hanley AJ, Zinman B. 2008. Glucose intolerance in pregnancy and future risk of pre-diabetes or diabetes. *Diabetes Care* 31(10):2026-2031.

- Rubin DB. 2004. Multiple imputation for nonresponse in surveys. Hoboken, N.J. Wiley-Interscience.
- Sacks DA, Hadden DR, Maresh M, Deerochanawong C, Dyer AR, Metzger BE, et al. 2012. Frequency of gestational diabetes mellitus at collaborating centers based on IADPSG consensus panel-recommended criteria: the Hyperglycemia and Adverse Pregnancy Outcome (HAPO) Study. *Diabetes Care* 35(3):526-528.
- Saldana TM, Siega-Riz AM, Adair LS, Suchindran C. 2006. The relationship between pregnancy weight gain and glucose tolerance status among black and white women in central North Carolina. *Am J Obstet Gynecol* 195(6):1629-1635.
- Sermer M, Naylor CD, Gare DJ, Kenshole AB, Ritchie JW, Farine D, et al. 1995. Impact of increasing carbohydrate intolerance on maternal-fetal outcomes in 3637 women without gestational diabetes. The Toronto Tri-Hospital Gestational Diabetes Project. *Am J Obstet Gynecol* 173(1):146-156.
- Solomon CG, Willett WC, Carey VJ, Rich-Edwards J, Hunter DJ, Colditz GA, et al. 1997. A prospective study of pregravid determinants of gestational diabetes mellitus. *JAMA* 278(13):1078-1083.
- Sun Q, Yue P, Deiuliis JA, Lumeng CN, Kampfrath T, Mikolaj MB, et al. 2009. Ambient air pollution exaggerates adipose inflammation and insulin resistance in a mouse model of diet-induced obesity. *Circulation* 119(4):538-546.
- Tovar A, Must A, Bermudez OI, Hyatt RR, Chasan-Taber L. 2009. The impact of gestational weight gain and diet on abnormal glucose tolerance during pregnancy in Hispanic women. *Matern Child Health J* 13(4):520-530.
- United States Census Bureau. 2000a. Census 2000 Summary File 3. Available:<http://www.census.gov/census2000/sumfile3.html>. [Accessed 18 September 2013]
- United States Census Bureau. 2000b. American Factfinder. Available: <http://factfinder2.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/index.html>. [Accessed 13 July, 2013].
- van den Hooven EH, Jaddoe VW, de Kluizenaar Y, Hofman A, Mackenbach JP, Steegers EA, et al. 2009. Residential traffic exposure and pregnancy-related outcomes: a prospective birth cohort study. *Environ Health* 8:59.

- Wang G, Jiang R, Zhao Z, Song W. 2013. Effects of ozone and fine particulate matter (PM_{2.5}) on rat system inflammation and cardiac function. *Toxicol Lett* 217(1):23-33.
- White IR, Royston P, Wood AM. 2011. Multiple imputation using chained equations: Issues and guidance for practice. *Stat Med* 30(4):377-399.
- Xu X, Liu C, Xu Z, Tzan K, Zhong M, Wang A, et al. 2011. Long-term exposure to ambient fine particulate pollution induces insulin resistance and mitochondrial alteration in adipose tissue. *Toxicol Sci* 124(1):88-98.
- Yanosky JD, Paciorek CJ, Suh HH. 2009. Predicting chronic fine and coarse particulate exposures using spatiotemporal models for the Northeastern and Midwestern United States. *Environ Health Perspect* 117(4):522-529.
- Ye J. 2013. Mechanisms of insulin resistance in obesity. *Front Med* 7(1):14-24.
- Zeka A, Melly SJ, Schwartz J. 2008. The effects of socioeconomic status and indices of physical environment on reduced birth weight and preterm births in Eastern Massachusetts. *Environ Health* 7:60.

Table 1. Of 2,093 women eligible to be included in the analyses, sample sizes for each analysis varied based on the exposure method.

Exposure	Sample size	Inclusion criteria
Central-site PM _{2.5}	1,943	Residential address within 40 km of the central monitoring site
Spatiotemporal PM _{2.5}	1,584	Second trimester began after March 2000 (at which time satellite data became available)
Central-site black carbon	1,943	Residential address within 40 km of the central monitoring site
Spatiotemporal black carbon	2,069	Residential address within our spatiotemporal black carbon model area, which included Eastern Massachusetts
Neighborhood traffic density	2,081	Residential address in Massachusetts mainland
Home roadway proximity	2,092	Residential address able to be geocoded

Table 2. Characteristics of participants in Project Viva [mean \pm SD or N (%)], overall^a and by spatiotemporal PM_{2.5} quartile.^b

Characteristic	Overall	PM _{2.5} Q1	PM _{2.5} Q2	PM _{2.5} Q3	PM _{2.5} Q4
Maternal age at enrollment (years)	31.8 \pm 5.2	32.0 \pm 4.9	31.7 \pm 5.2	32.0 \pm 5.0	31.9 \pm 5.4
Prepregnancy BMI (kg/m ²)	24.9 \pm 5.6	24.8 \pm 5.9	24.7 \pm 5.1	24.8 \pm 5.1	24.8 \pm 5.6
Pregnancy weight gain to OGTT (kg)	10.2 \pm 4.4	10.4 \pm 4.3	10.0 \pm 4.2	10.0 \pm 4.4	10.5 \pm 4.9
Central-site PM _{2.5} (μg/m ³)	10.9 \pm 1.4	9.9 \pm 0.7	10.7 \pm 0.7	11.5 \pm 0.9	12.5 \pm 1.3
Spatiotemporal PM _{2.5} (μg/m ³)	11.9 \pm 1.4	10.2 \pm 0.5	11.3 \pm 0.3	12.3 \pm 0.3	13.8 \pm 0.8
Central-site black carbon (μg/m ³)	0.9 \pm 0.1	0.8 \pm 0.1	0.8 \pm 0.1	0.8 \pm 0.1	0.9 \pm 0.1
Spatiotemporal black carbon (μg/m ³)	0.7 \pm 0.2	0.6 \pm 0.2	0.7 \pm 0.2	0.7 \pm 0.2	0.8 \pm 0.2
Traffic density [(vehicles/day) x km]	1,621 \pm 2,234	1,368 \pm 2,201	1,692 \pm 2,256	1,722 \pm 2,081	1,716 \pm 2,237
Roadway proximity (\leq 200 m)	281 (13%)	39 (10%)	55 (14%)	58 (15%)	60 (15%)
College graduate	1354 (65%)	260 (66%)	258 (65%)	264 (67%)	257 (65%)
Race/ethnicity					
White	1,397 (67%)	287 (73%)	265 (67%)	255 (64%)	253 (64%)
Black	345 (17%)	51 (13%)	68 (17%)	58 (15%)	69 (17%)
Asian	118 (6%)	15 (4%)	22 (5%)	31 (8%)	21 (5%)
Hispanic	153 (7%)	23 (6%)	28 (7%)	34 (9%)	40 (10%)
Other	80 (4%)	19 (5%)	13 (3%)	17 (4%)	12 (3%)
Family history of diabetes	165 (8%)	32 (8%)	25 (6%)	33 (8%)	38 (10%)
Prior history of gestational diabetes					
Yes	42 (2%)	10 (3%)	4 (1%)	7 (2%)	10 (3%)
No	1,052 (50%)	216 (55%)	204 (51%)	210 (53%)	180 (45%)
Nulliparous	999 (48%)	170 (43%)	188 (47%)	179 (45%)	206 (52%)
Glucose tolerance					
GDM	118 (6%)	27 (7%)	15 (4%)	23 (6%)	21 (5%)
IGT	65 (3%)	9 (2%)	9 (2%)	12 (3%)	21 (5%)
Failed GCT/normal OGTT	180 (9%)	29 (7%)	33 (8%)	44 (11%)	30 (8%)
Normal	1,730 (83%)	331 (84%)	339 (86%)	317 (80%)	324 (82%)

^aOverall sample sizes for exposures are per Table 1. For all other characteristics, imputed data are shown (n = 2,093). Non-imputed data are available in Supplemental Material, Table S2. ^bSpatiotemporal PM_{2.5} quartile ranges and sample sizes: Q1 (8.3-10.0 μg/m³; n = 396), Q2 (10.0-10.7 μg/m³; n = 396), Q3 (10.7-11.7 μg/m³; n = 396), Q4 (11.7-17.2 μg/m³; n = 396).

Table 3. Covariate-adjusted^a odds ratios (95% confidence intervals) for failed GCT/normal OGTT, impaired glucose tolerance (IGT), and gestational diabetes mellitus (GDM) as compared to normal glucose tolerance during pregnancy.

Exposure	Failed GCT/normal OGTT	IGT	GDM
Central-site PM_{2.5}			
Q1 (8.3-10.0 µg/m ³)	1.0 (Reference)	1.0 (Reference)	1.0 (Reference)
Q2 (10.0-10.7 µg/m ³)	1.15 (0.70, 1.90)	1.43 (0.62, 3.34)	0.91 (0.50, 1.65)
Q3 (10.7-11.7 µg/m ³)	1.05 (0.64, 1.72)	1.44 (0.63, 3.29)	0.52 (0.27, 1.00)
Q4 (11.7-17.2 µg/m ³)	1.31 (0.80, 2.13)	1.90 (0.84, 4.31)	0.69 (0.38, 1.27)
IQR (1.7 µg/m ³)	1.15 (0.93, 1.41)	1.34 (0.98, 1.84)	0.81 (0.62, 1.08)
Spatiotemporal PM_{2.5}			
Q1 (8.5-10.8 µg/m ³)	1.0 (Reference)	1.0 (Reference)	1.0 (Reference)
Q2 (10.8-11.8 µg/m ³)	1.19 (0.69, 2.03)	1.14 (0.44, 2.95)	0.62 (0.30, 1.28)
Q3 (11.8-12.8 µg/m ³)	1.71 (1.03, 2.84)	1.46 (0.60, 3.59)	0.93 (0.48, 1.78)
Q4 (12.8-15.9 µg/m ³)	1.11 (0.64, 1.94)	2.63 (1.15, 6.01)	0.71 (0.35, 1.42)
IQR (2.0 µg/m ³)	1.08 (0.84, 1.40)	1.64 (1.11, 2.42)	0.94 (0.67, 1.34)
Central-site black carbon			
Q1 (0.60-0.78 µg/m ³)	1.0 (Reference)	1.0 (Reference)	1.0 (Reference)
Q2 (0.78-0.87 µg/m ³)	0.98 (0.60, 1.62)	1.16 (0.54, 2.54)	0.75 (0.39, 1.45)
Q3 (0.87-0.94 µg/m ³)	1.53 (0.82, 2.87)	2.41 (0.87, 6.69)	0.59 (0.25, 1.35)
Q4 (0.94-1.10 µg/m ³)	1.18 (0.58, 2.40)	2.87 (0.93, 8.83)	0.60 (0.23, 1.53)
IQR (0.16 µg/m ³)	1.11 (0.76, 1.63)	1.36 (0.74, 2.49)	0.69 (0.42, 1.13)
Spatiotemporal black carbon			
Q1 (0.14-0.55 µg/m ³)	1.0 (Reference)	1.0 (Reference)	1.0 (Reference)
Q2 (0.55-0.70 µg/m ³)	1.03 (0.67, 1.58)	1.39 (0.66, 2.96)	1.01 (0.54, 1.87)
Q3 (0.70-0.89 µg/m ³)	1.03 (0.65, 1.63)	1.86 (0.87, 3.98)	1.12 (0.59, 2.09)
Q4 (0.89-1.69 µg/m ³)	1.02 (0.62, 1.68)	1.50 (0.65, 3.50)	0.90 (0.45, 1.79)
IQR (0.34 µg/m ³)	1.01 (0.79, 1.29)	1.09 (0.74, 1.62)	1.02 (0.73, 1.41)
Neighborhood traffic density			
Q1 (0-4,061) ^b	1.0 (Reference)	1.0 (Reference)	1.0 (Reference)
Q2 (4,062-9,680) ^b	1.51 (0.97, 2.36)	1.72 (0.79, 3.75)	1.18 (0.66, 2.11)
Q3 (9,680-19,371) ^b	1.24 (0.78, 1.98)	1.04 (0.44, 2.48)	0.94 (0.51, 1.72)
Q4 (19,383-30,860) ^b	1.38 (0.86, 2.21)	2.66 (1.24, 5.71)	0.74 (0.39, 1.42)
IQR (1533) ^b	1.12 (1.03, 1.23)	1.15 (1.00, 1.31)	1.02 (0.87, 1.18)
Home roadway proximity			
> 200 m	1.0 (Reference)	1.0 (Reference)	1.0 (Reference)
≤ 200 m	1.12 (0.69, 1.80)	1.83 (0.96, 3.51)	0.99 (0.52, 1.88)

^aAdjusted for age, pre-pregnancy BMI, pregnancy weight gain, education, race/ethnicity, family history of diabetes, prior GDM, and season of last menstrual period. ^bVehicles/day x km road within 100 m.

Figure Legend

Figure 1. Associations of second trimester exposure to PM_{2.5}, second trimester exposure to black carbon, neighborhood traffic density based on enrollment address, and home roadway proximity based on enrollment address, with risk for impaired glucose tolerance and gestational diabetes mellitus during pregnancy. Data from 2,093 Boston-area pregnant women in Project Viva. IQR, interquartile range. IQR 0.16 µg/m³ for central-site black carbon, 0.34 µg/m³ for spatiotemporal black carbon, 1.7 µg/m³ for central-site PM_{2.5}, 2.0 µg/m³ for spatiotemporal PM_{2.5}, 1533 vehicles/day x km for neighborhood traffic density

Figure 1

